

Minates

### June 9, 2015 Council Chambers – Lower Level 57 East 1<sup>st</sup> Street 4:30 PM

A work session of the Design Review Board was held at the City of Mesa Council Chamber – Lower Level, 57 East 1<sup>st</sup> Street at 4:30 p.m.

### **Board Members Present:**

Eric Paul – Chair Taylor Candland Nicole Posten-Thompson Brian Sandstrom Sean Banda

## Staff Present:

John Wesley
Tom Ellsworth
Lesley Davis
Lisa Davis
Wahid Alam
Kim Steadman
Kaelee Wilson
Michael Gildenstern

### **Board Members Absent:**

Tracy Roedel

### **Others Present:**

Mark Abel Tim Rasnake Greg Hitchens Michael Hall Lon Palmer

Chairperson Paul welcomed everyone to the Work Session at 4:38 p.m.

A. Discuss and Provide Direction Regarding Design Review cases:

### Item A.1. DR15-020 Burger King Restaurant (PLN2015-00136)

**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** 10025 East Southern Avenue

**REQUEST:** Review of a proposed restaurant with a drive-thru

**COUNCIL DISTRICT**: 6

OWNER: KRAF Inc., owner
APPLICANT: Mark Abel Architects
ARCHITECT: Mark Abel Architects

**STAFF PLANNER:** Kaelee Wilson

#### Discussion:

Staff member, Kaelee Wilson, presented the case to the Board.

Staff identified the following concerns with the proposed drive-thru restaurant:

- 1. Suggested tying the project more into the Mountain Vista Medical Center to the east, possibly by incorporating the columns seen on the hospital into the new drive-thru
- 2. Suggested green screens
- 3. Suggested outdoor seating and integrated canopies along Southern Avenue, to which the applicant submitted tree grates and trees for shade, which Staff saw as a fair compromise
- 4. Proposed incorporating an artistic component to the forthcoming signage, i.e. Rusted metal mountains/saguaro, to create an identity on the corner

#### Chairperson Paul:

Concerned with the queuing distance at the menu board

#### Vice-Chairperson Sandstrom:

- Liked the lighting accents on the drive-thru canopy
- Confirmed that there are proposed sconces to break up the monotony of the wall
- Confirmed that the V-Joint cuts into EFIS, and it will have a stucco finish
- Confirmed that the green screens are sticking out roughly 8", and that the plantings are recessed within the frames (suggested lighting on plantings)

### Boardmember Banda:

- Was curious about metal banding seen at other Burger Kings, but was informed that that has fallen out of use because of weathering concerns
- Inquired about laser cut letters, but was informed that they have utilized all of the allowable sign area. If desired, the applicant would need to request a Comprehensive Sign Plan through the Board of Adjustment

#### Boardmember Posten-Thompson:

 Would like to see vertical stucco expansion joints, but applicant explained that the design intentionally features a horizontal plain contrasted with vertical stone features

### Item A.2. DR15-023 Mellow Mushroom (PLN2015-00188)

**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** 1665 South Stapley Drive

**REQUEST:** Review of a proposed restaurant

**COUNCIL DISTRICT:** 3

**OWNER:** Vestar Development Company

**APPLICANT:** Tim Rasnake, Archicon

ARCHITECT: Tim Rasnake
STAFF PLANNER: Kim Steadman

#### Discussion:

Staff member, Kim Steadman, presented the case to the Board.

Staff identified the following concerns with the proposed restaurant:

1. Were concerned with the use of wood materials on the exterior, due to the potential wear caused by the weather, but it has since been resolved and changed

### Chairperson Paul:

• Liked the canopies over the eating areas

#### Boardmember Banda:

- Liked the art installations within the restaurant
- Liked the diversity in the signage, was hopeful that some would be neon

### Boardmember Posten-Thompson:

• Confirmed with the applicant that there will be lit signage on the exterior

### Item A.3. DR15-024 The Heritage of Mesa (PLN2015-00199)

**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** SWC of Crismon Road and Southern Avenue REQUEST: Swc of a proposed assisted living facility

**COUNCIL DISTRICT**: 6

OWNER: Ocean Property Holdings, LLC, owner
APPLICANT: Jessica Sarkissian, Bowman Consulting
ARCHITECT: J. Marc Tolson, Arrive Architecture

**STAFF PLANNER:** Lisa Davis

### Discussion:

Staff member, Lisa Davis presented the case to the Board.

Staff identified the following concerns with the proposed assisted living facility:

- 1. More variation on the eastern elevation that fronts onto Signal Butte Rd. to create more of a push and pull on the footprint of the building
- 2. More differentiation on how the metal features are being applied; the metal canopies are seen as repetitive
- 3. More information needs to be provided on the scuppers, as they need to be internalized

The Board agreed with comments by staff in regard to the need to include more variation in the roof lines. The applicant was not in attendance.

#### Chairperson Paul:

- Liked the southern elevation
- Suggested marking the entry way more clearly by creating a porte cochere

#### Vice-Chairperson Sandstrom:

- Suggested revising the proposed landscape at the northwest portion of the site to accommodate more parking for additional visitors rather than requesting the reduction in required parking through Planning and Zoning
- Wanted to see more variation in parapet heights on the east elevation
- Suggested that the roofline at the entry be raised to allow for greater variation and play in the proposed roof heights
- Proposed incorporating more attached and indirect lighting on the building, including more entry way illumination
- Concerned that the proposed AC Units are not depicted and wanted to ensure that the chosen methods will be properly screened or incorporated into the design of the project. Will there be a separate A/C unit for each room?
- Suggested defining the entry more clearly by increasing the width and depth
- Suggested increasing the depth of the steps along the building elevations to create the true change in plane for shade and shadow. The amount indicated on the floor plan was not enough to be distinguishable.

### Boardmember Posten-Thompson:

- Liked the courtyard design incorporated into the floorplan
- Liked the south elevation, but felt that the north elevation was long and undistinguished
- Liked the elements of the entry, but suggested that the design should include a wider overhang and incorporate a covered drive
- Suggested that the landscape design along Crismon Rd. be reviewed to ensure the best design and incorporate varying landscape material adjacent to the building
- Suggested engaging the driveway more, and proposed bringing out the canopy a little wider to mark the entry

#### Boardmember Candland:

 Would like to see more variation on the north elevation, the depth of each step along the elevation should be increased to create the true shade and shadow needed for the elevation

#### Boardmember Banda:

- Proposed delineating the entry with stamped concrete
- Would like to see attached lighting incorporated into the design of the building

### Item A.4. DR15-025 Rosemont Office Warehouses (PLN2015-00200)

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 1715, 1737, 1759 North Rosemont Office Warehouses

**REQUEST:** Review of a proposed office warehouse building

COUNCIL DISTRICT: 5

OWNER: Ranchland Holdings II LLC APPLICANT: Greg Hitchens Architecture

ARCHITECT: Greg Hitchens STAFF PLANNER: Kim Steadman

#### Discussion:

Staff member, Kim Steadman, presented the case to the Board.

Staff identified the following concerns with the proposed office warehouse building:

- 1. Suggested that the project come more in line with design quality of the surrounding buildings to the south and to the west
- 2. Concerned that the component that abuts the street is a little too flat and plain

### Chairperson Paul:

- Liked the material, proposed playing with different massings and punch outs, to break up the plains
- Suggested creating shadow lines in the block and using a variation of colors
- Suggested a more narrow block on the parapet to create a break in the line
- Wanted to see more verticality communicated in the project

#### Vice-Chairperson Sandstrom:

- Would like to see an increase of visual interest in the building
- Recommended a variation in heights along the roof line
- Suggested designing shadow lines into the block

#### Boardmember Posten-Thompson:

- Was concerned about the lack of visual stimulation on the project compared to what's
  across the street in terms of varying heights, and cited the interplay between stucco and
  block cornices, color, and canopies on the adjacent buildings
- Referenced Pierpont Center on Baseline as a building that uses an abundance of masonry types and colors and includes a decorative banding
- Recommended some sort of glass up front, possibly a storefront component
- Suggested more shadowplay and delineation in the block
- Recommend altering the levels at which the canopies are fastened to the building on the western elevation

#### Boardmember Banda:

 Was concerned with the lack of articulation on the building, would like to see more play on the vertical and horizontal elements

### Item A.5. DR15-026 MGC Isotainer Parking (PLN2015-00220)

**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** 6560 South Mountain Road

**REQUEST:** Review of a proposed isotainer parking lot

**COUNCIL DISTRICT**: 6

OWNER: MGC Pure Chemical America APPLICANT: Michael A. Hall Architects LLC

ARCHITECT: Mike Hall STAFF PLANNER: Wahid Alam

### Discussion:

Staff member, Wahid Alam, presented the case to the Board.

Staff did not identify any concerns with the proposed isotainer parking lot.

#### Vice-Chairperson Sandstrom:

• Confirmed with Staffmember Alam that the applicant is using wrought iron with points to create a "candy-cane" fence

### Boardmember Banda:

Liked the landscaped alcove

#### Item A.5. DR15-027 Sheraton Riverview-Phase 2

**LOCATION/ADDRESS:** 860 North Riverview

**REQUEST:** Review of Phase 2 at the Sheraton Riverview

COUNCIL DISTRICT:

**OWNER:** Riverview Hotels, LLC., owner.

APPLICANT: Lon Palmer
ARCHITECT: Eric Miller
STAFF PLANNER: Lesley Davis

#### Discussion:

Staff member, Lesley Davis, presented the case to the Board.

Staff identified the following concerns with the proposed hotel addition:

- 1. Staff was concerned with activating the street along the sidewalk, and proposed including more glass
- Staff was concerned with the massive 700' wall fronting on the paseo and pointed out the importance of a pedestrian friendly walkway as it leads from the hotel to the Cub's Stadium. Staff also suggested that some minor modifications in design would be helpful to break up that long four story wall.
- 3. Staff pointed out that the windows on the west end of the building will have to be eliminated to comply with fire code requirements because they are on the property line. Additional detailing will be needed on that elevation where those windows existed.

#### Chairperson Paul:

- Asked if it was possible to move the building further from the street
- Clarified the uses, and confirmed that there is a planned entrance to the bowling alley through the north side of the building

#### Vice-Chairperson Sandstrom:

- Liked that the planned doors open to the sidewalk to create opportunities to activate the walkway
- Felt that the setback is adequate, as long as there are patios, benches, and other amenities to activate the sidewalk
- Suggested using the rectangular punch windows to create visual interest inside and out at street level at the bowling center
- Proposed landscaping and design features along the wall fronting the sidewalk to break up the mass of blank stucco
- Liked the consistent manicured look of the new addition in relation to the existing building

#### Boardmember Posten-Thompson:

 Proposed that the entry tower at the bowling center be modified slightly to have the same language, materials and colors as the hotel, but to differentiate it slightly more similar to the previously approved towers for the expansion approved with the original

### hotel elevations

• Proposed adding a water feature near the sidewalk to activate the walkway

### Boardmember Candland:

• Liked that the proposed building design elements and color scheme matched the existing component of the hotel

#### Boardmember Banda:

- Proposed using complimentary architectural elements, but with a slight variation to differentiate the new building from the existing structure
- Proposed adding more architectural details to the new up-market suite component of the property

- B. <u>Call to Order:</u>
  - Chairperson Paul called the meeting to order at 6:07 p.m.
- C. Approval of the minutes of the May 12, 2015 meeting:
  On a motion by Boardmember Banda, seconded by Boardmember Posten-Thompson, the Board unanimously approved the May 15, 2015 minutes. Vote-(approved 5-0) (Absent: Boardmember Roedel)
- D. <u>Discuss and take action on the following Design Review cases:</u>

F.	Other Business None.
G.	Adjournment The Work Session concluded at 6:09 p.m.
Respe	ctfully submitted,
Mike Gildenstern Planning Assistant	
mg	